2-00 P.M.

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—In view of the present policy of enforcing prohibition and sending prohibition offenders to Jail, will the Government introduce any other alternative method to attain the end of prohibition?

SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—This matter deserves serious consideration.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Have the Government thought of scrapping prohibition?

SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—The Government have not made up their mind either way.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎಂ. ದೇವ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಟೀಮ್ ರಿಪೋರ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈಚೆಗೆ ಪ್ರೊಹಿಬಿಷನ್ ರೂಲ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿದುದರಿಂದ ಸಮಾಜ ಕಲ್ಯಾಣ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಯ್ತು? ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಏನಾದರೂ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿದೆಯೇ?

MR. SPEAKER.—I will tell the House, it is very likely there will be a statement tomorrow.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಆರ್. ಕೇಶವ ಮೂರ್ತಿ.—ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಸಮಾಜ ಕಲ್ಯಾಣ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರೊಹಿಬಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ತರಹ ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿದ ಪೊಲಿಟಿಕಲ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ ವೋಟು ಕೊಡಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಮಹಿಳೆಯರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ?

MR. SPEAKER.—The question of vote does not come under this question. Question hour is over.

QUESTION FOR ANSWER ON THE DAY

(but not taken up)

Saving Schemes effected at Government Level.

*Q.—83. SRI B. BHASKAR SHETTY (Kaup);—

Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(*a*) the various saving schemes effected at the Government level, on account of the present National Emergency;

(*b*) the estimated amount of savings per month on account of the above schemes;

(*c*) when the said schemes were started and how long they would be continued?

*A.—SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—

(*a*) Copies of Government Orders regarding Economy Measures are placed on the Table of the House. Copy placed in the Mysore Legislature Library (*vide* No. 5, dated 4th February 1966).

(SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE)

(*b*) Savings per month cannot be calculated as this is a continuous process. During the current year in view of the gap in resources expenditure under Plan and Non-Plan has been cut down. This will result in saving of about Rs. 8 crores dnring the current year.

(*c*) The Economy Orders will be in force till the Emergency lasts.

MEMBER'S REPRESENTATION

SRI K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—I rise to a point of order. I had submitted a Calling attention Notice regarding veterinary students' strike. The Hon'ble Speaker has directed the Government to give a reply or to make a statement today, and the Food Minister who was present yesterday promised that he would do it today. But I am surprised to know that priority is given to another Calling attention Notice. If there is any sanctity attached to the promise made to this House and also the words of the Hon'ble Speaker, I want to know the reason why my Calling attention Notice is not yet replied to.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ.ಸಿ.ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ (ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಪಾಲ್ ಆಟೋಕ್ಷನ್ ಸೋಟೀಸು ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪಶುವಿನ ಕಾಲೇಜು ವಿದ್ಯಾರ್ಥಿಗಳು.....

MR. SPEAKER.—Does not the Hon'ble Member want the Chair to give a ruling on the point of order raised ? If there is a point of order, The Chair must give a ruling.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—There are so many points of orders which have been raised in this House and decisions on them are still awaited from the Hon'ble Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member must furnish a list in an hour with regard to matters which have been raised by way of points of orders and on which rulings have not been given.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—Three days back, Sri C. J. Muckannappa raised a constitutional point of order regarding the portions which are not covered by the Governor's Address. Regarding that also, ruling is not given.

MR. SPEAKER.—Is this a kind of civility that the Member shows ? Is that a kind of response the Member shows ?

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—There was a ruling just given by the Hon'ble Speaker that we have to take the report placed on the Table as the report read to the House. There was a ruling. Let not my friend drag my name.

MR. SPEAKER.—Is it not better for this Hon'ble Member to confine to himself rather than invoke names of members who let him down ? I want to decide if ever there was a charge that ruling has not been given.

There is not a single matter which has been left open till now. So, I want the Member to tell me if there is any instance where ruling has not been given.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—By memory I submit to the Hon'ble Speaker that there are several instances where rulings have not been given because it may be either in the interest of this House or in the interest of the Members that these rulings might have been withheld by the Hon'ble Speaker. Or for want of time, rulings might have been withheld. I will submit in detail if the Hon'ble Speaker directs me to do so.

MR. SPEAKER.—Does the Hon'ble Member still maintain that there are points of orders raised and not ruled upon ? If his memory is so bad, he must not venture to assert and disturb the even course of the work in the House. Without having a single instance, he says a large number of points of order. I will give him time till tomorrow. If he furnishes a list, I will try todeal with them. Otherwise, I will certainly call for an explanation from this Member. The point of order now raised is absolutely irrelevant and unfounded. If a calling attention notice is given and if it is admitted and if there is a delayed answer after admission, it cannot be a matter for raising a point of order. There cannot be a point of order regarding the procedure.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—The Hon'ble Minister has promised this House to give a reply today, but he has not done so.

MR. SPEAKER.— Is that a point of order ?

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—Is there any sanctity attached to this House ?

MR. SPEAKER.—This particular member seems to have some notions of sanctity peculiar to his mind. He should not inflict it on others. What does he mean by sanctity ?

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—The words of the Minister on the Floor of the House have got some respect. They have to be fulfilled.

MR. SPEAKER.—On the other hand, the Member is committing breach of orders in series, one after another. He has no business to raise points not covered by the Agenda before the House. He should not have done it. The Members must behave better.

CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE :

Re : The Agitation by the Free Water Supply Action Committee

SRI S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).— Sir, I desire to call the attention of the Minister for Development, Panchayat Raj and Municipal Administration to the agitation by the Water Supply Action Committee.

SRI R. M. PATIL (Minister for Municipal Administration).—In reply to the Call Attention I beg to state a few words. It is absolutely essential to know the history of the water supply to the city of Bangalore. From that point of view I will give details under which circumstance the problem has arisen.

(Sri R. M. Patil)

Prior to 1895, Bangalore depended for Drinking Water on a number of tanks such as Dharmambudhi, Sampangi, Ulsoor, etc., supplemented by Local Wells and Kalyanis or tepped ponds. This supply was not only inadequate but also not wholesome. The great statesman Dewan Sir K. Seshadri Iyer minuted as under in 1892 :—

> "Pretty sources in the neighbourhood of Bangalore were investigated and found to be more or less unsatisfactory. For an unfailing supply, we must go to some stream, partaking as far as possible, of a perennial character and build across it a Reservoir capable of containing a three years' supply. The nearest such stream is the Arkavathy".

In pursuance of the above direction, the first protected Water Supply Scheme, based on the nearest river source, *viz.*, Arkavathy was started in 1894, with Hessarghatta Reservoir across the said River Arkavathy as the source. The population of Bangalore then was 1,80,000 and Hessarghatta Reservoir was designed to cater to a prospective population of 2,50,000 at a *per capita* rate of 12½ gallons per head per day. The water was brought through an open air duct for a length of 5 miles and then pumped through a rising main of 10 miles length against a total head of 400 feet into treatment units located at Bangalore. This scheme proved so inadequate by 1925 that the State Government had to constitute an export committee under the Chairmanship of late *Bharatha Ratna* Sir M. Visvesvaraya to examine the question and to suggest remedial measures to solve the water supply problem of Bangalore City. This Committee recommended further exploitation of Arkavathy River, by constructing a new storage reservoir at Thippagondanahally, about 25 miles lower down Hessarghatta. It was proposed to impound 2,364 M.C.ft. of water at Thippagondanahally during thefirst stage and 3,030 M.C.ft. later, in the final stage. The first stage works designed in 1928 envisaged a supply of 6million gallons per day through a 24" Rising main, making available at a rate of 20 gallons per head per day for a population of 3,00,000. This first stage was put into service during March 1933 by which time the population of Bangalore had already reached 3,40,000 making it necessary to take up the 2nd stage works early.

Additions and improvements for the works were started from 1942 by way of laying a duplicate main of 27" diameter and addition of more filters and pumpsets. The supplies were gradually stepped up from the year 1942 to 1951 to about 10. 8 million gallons per day from Thippagondanahally and 1.4 million gallons per day from Hessarghatta. By 1956 the population of Bangalore was over 10 lakhs and the per capita supply was hardly 12 gollons. In 1953-54 Government sanctioned estimates for impounding of the full quantity of 3,038 M.C.ft. at Thippagondanahally with a view to step up the supply to 15 million gallons per day. These additional works were completed by 1958-59 and a supply of 15 million gallons per day was ensured to the City from the Thippagondana-

hally source in addition to about 3 million gallons per day from Hessarghatta. But the population of greater Bangalore is nearly 15 lakhs now and the *per capita* supply is hardly 12 gallons after allowing for Industrial consumption.

To augment supplies to this rapidly growing City, Hydrological studies of Arkavathy Valley and the actual performance and behaviour of Thippagondanahally Reservoir were made and the studies revealed that a draw of 25 million gallons per day to Bangalore from this source was available. Another main of 36" dia. with necessary accessories to ensure this total supply of 25 million gallons per day was proposed laying of 36' CI. Pipe Line with necessary addition of calrifloculators, Filaters, Pumpsets, etc estimated to cost Rs. 2 55 crores was sanctioned by Government in March 1960 and the works are under progress. These works are expected to be completed early in 1966 and will ensure drawal of 25 million gallons per day from Thippagondanahally to Bangalore. This supply, in addition to the supply of 5 million gallons per day from Hessarghatta will ultimately give a total supply of 30 million gallons per day to Bangalore by the end of 1966.

II. Growth of Population in Bangalore City

The population of Bangalore City has been growing rapidly as indicated in the statement below :—

Year	*Metropolitan area in lakhs*	*Percentage increase*	*City Corporation in lakhs*	*Percentage increase*
1901 ..	2.28	..	1.61	..
1911 ..	2.60	14.5	1.62	19.6
1921 ..	3.11	27.5	3.08	23.4
1931 ..	3.96	27.5	3.08	29.1
1941 ..	5.10	28.9	4.07	32.6
1951 ..	9.91	94.9	7.79	91.6
1961 ..	12.07	21.4	9.06	16.7

III. Long Range Water Supply Scheme now under Implementation.

2-30 P.M.

With a view to satisfactorily solve the problems of Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage on an enduringbasis, a comprehensive scheme was prepared early in 1963 and was sent up to the Government of India for approval. All the available sources for water were duly examined and is was found that Cauvery was the only source which could be depended

(SRI R. M. PATIL)

upon for water supply to Bangalore considering all the factors such as dependability, quality and cost, both capital and recurring. It is therefore, proposed to draw water from Cauvery in adequate quantities, so as to make available 40 gallons per capita per day, excluding Industrial requirements.

Cauvery is a perennial river and its flow is sufficient to assure a supply, of 60 million gallons per day for most of the period in a year. When the summer flow in the river becomes insufficient to meet the requirements it is proposed to supplement the same from the storage at Kabini Reservoir which is under construction. The Water from Cauvery is to be tapped at Shivasamudram anicut, put up by the same illustrious Dewan Sir K. Seshadri Iyer in 1900. The said water is to be conveyed 6 miles through the existing Power Channel belonging to Mysore State Electricity Board up to Netkal Balancing Reservoir. Necessary Improvements to utilise the existing channel will be made under this scheme and the water is to be next conveyed by a 69 inches diameter prestressed concrete pipe of length 30,000 feet, by gravity from Netkal Balancing Reservoir to the Treatment Works located near Thorekadanahalli, on the banks of River Shimsha. At the treatment works, the raw water is chemically dosed, flocculated, clarified, filtered and finally disinfected. Here, a Laboratory is proposed to be established for detailed physical, chemical and bacteriological examination of water. The water after treatment is pumped up from the treatment works to Bangalore City.

The total lift from Treatment Works at Thorekadanahalli to South-end Circle in Bangalore is 1,350 feet over a engtn of about 2,62,000 feet. This lift is to be negotiated in 4 stages of pumping. The stages of pumping have been so chosen to arrive at the most economical use of classes of pipes

Suitable capacity pumping units to pump 60 milliongallons per day with necessary standby have been provided at each of the pumping stations.

As per detailed plans and estimates prepared the total cost of the scheme to ensure a supply of 60 million gallons per day of water up to Storage Reservoir is Rs. 15.82 crores.

A total storage equivalent to 24 hours supply from Cauvery has been provided in the various Distribution Reservoirs. These Reservoirs will ensure proper distribution of water to the citizens at a minimum residual head of 30 feet. The total estimated cost of these Reservoirs, and improvements to the internal distribution system for the immediate stage is Rs. 3.68 crores.

A well designed Sewerage System to Bangalore is a necessity to ensure proper disposal of the increased quantity of sewage after implementation of the above Water Supply Scheme. Re-modelling of entire sewerage system of the City together with sewage treatment units is estimated to cost Rs. 6.5 crores.

Thus the total overall cost of providing additional water supply and sanitary facilities to Bangalore will be Rs. 26.00 crores. This has been duly approved by the Government of India.

This is the first stage of the Project. The Transmission Main is to be duplicated later on, in order to obtain additional supply of 60 million gallons per day, to meet the demands of the growing city.

Till 1st April 1956, the Bangalore Corporation was paying at the whole sale rate of 7.25 annas per 1,000 gallons in respect of Water Supply made available in bulk, at the Combined Jewel Filters, Malleswaram, for distribution to consumers in the City and the consumers were paying at One Rupee per 1,000 gallons. In view of additional investments made by Government on Water Works, the said whole sale rate of 7.25 annas per 1,000 gallons was raised to 10.50 annas per 1,000 gallons with effect from 1st April 1956. The Corporation however continued to pay at the old rate of 7.25 annas for some years and later on agreed to enhance the same to only 8 annas per 1,000 gallons approved by Government with effect from 1st April 1956 had thus remained unimplemented till the transfer to the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board on 1st December 1964. The arrears due from the Corporation on this account is Rs. 95 lakhs.

At the other end, the Citizens had also continued to enjoy the benefit of the old retail rate of Rupee one per 1,000 gallons, till the recent enhancement to an average of Rs. 1.5 per 1,000 gallons to ordinary domestic consumers.

When the Corporation was supplying water in the City of Bangalore out of the property tax at a rate between 13½ to 15 % of the annual rental value of the buildings, a part that is 4– to 6 per cent was treated a water tax on the buildings. In consideration of receipt of this amount the Corporation was supplying for domestic consumption water between 3,000 to 10,000 gallons per month depending upon the rate of water tax collected, without payment of separate water charges.

There was, therefore, no free supply of water to the houses in the City of Bangalore when water was being supplied by the Corporation but a part of the property tax was treated as water tax and water to a limited extent was supplied without separate payment in consideration of the payment of water tax.

The Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Act, 1964, does not empower the Board to levy any tax on buildings. It cannot, therefore levy a tax and make supply of water in consideration of the amount paid as tax. As already stated the Board has to find necessary finances for executing the water supply and sewerage schemes and for maintaining the works and the establishment connected with the distribution and supply of water to the Bangalore Metropolitan Area. It has to work on economic basis. Taking into consideration the financial requirements, the water rates have been fixed. In respect of domestic supply lower rates than for non-domestic supply have been fixed, by the Board.

(SRI R. M. PATIL)

The question of supplying water without payment to a limited extentfor domestic purposes was examined by the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board. The Board is of the opinion that it would be possible to make such supply provided a lumpsum payment to cover the water charges is made to the Board. It was, therefore suggested to the then Mayor and certain other representatives of the Corporation to consider payment of a suitable amount out of the tax levied by the Corporation to the Board on the same basis as the Corporation was adjusting a portion of the property tax as water tax, so that the citizens of Bangalore can be given supply of water to a limited extent without separate payment for such water. But the Corporation has not accepted the suggestion to make a contribution to the Board which will enable the inhabitants of Bangalore getting supply of water without payment as before.

In this connection, it may be noticed that the Mysore Municipalities Act, 1964, contemplates the levy of not less than 17½ per cent of the annual rental value in the form of property tax in City Municipalities and not less than 12½ per cent in Town Municipalities to enable them to achieve this object. At present, the property tax levied in Gadag, Betgeri, Mangalore and Hubli is about 25 per cent of the annual rental value. In Bangalore the tax has since been reduced from between 13- to 15 per cent to between 10 to 13½ per cent of the annual rental value.

If the Corporation had continued the levy of property tax at the rate between 13¼ to 15 per cent which included a part adjusted as tax for water, and paid as contribution to the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board an amount equal to that part, it would have been possible for the Board to supply water to the inhabitants of the City for domestic consumption free of charge a proportionate quantity of water. But the Corporation thought it fit to reduce the property tax to a rate between 10 to 13½ percent which is lower than in any other City Municipality in the State and is also not inclined to make any contribution to the Board for giving any facility to the inhabitants. If property tax is levied at the rate of 17½ per cent of the annual rental value and the Corporation pays contribution to the Board of an amount equal to about 7½ per cent of the property tax, the Board will be able to supply to the citizens of Bangalore water free of charge for domestic consumption to the extent of 3,000 gallons per month and also supply water to the general public through about 2,000 street taps. Efforts have, therefore, to be made to persuade the Corporation to act in this direction.

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF THE REPORTS OF JOINT SELECT COMMITTEES ON :—

(i) *Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions and Trusts Bill*, 1962.

(ii) *Mysore Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Bill*, 1964.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance).—Sir, on behalf of the Minister for Revenue, I move :—

(*a*) " under the second proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 233 read with rule 247 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly that the time limit for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions and Trusts Bill, 1962 be extended till the end of October 1966."

(*b*) " under the second proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 233 read with rule 247 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly that the time limit for presentation of the report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Bill, 1964, be extended till the end of October 1966."

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is :—

" That under the Second proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 233 read with rule 247 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly that the time limit for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Religious and Charitable Institutions and Trusts Bill, 1962 be extended till the end of October 1966."

SRI S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—Sir, I want to know from the Government as to how many times they have taken extension of time in regard to this Bill.

SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—Sir, actually the Joint Select Committee has finished the work more than half and this is the second time we are coming with a request for extension of time.

MR. SPEAKER.—I may mention that last time it was mentioned that if there is going to be a Central Government Bill covering all the Trusts, this may be dropped. But, the Central Government Bill relates only to Hindu Endowments. Therefore, it is not fully covered by that.

The question is :—

" That under the Second proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 233 read with rule 247 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly that the time limit for.....

(MR. SPEAKER)

presentation of the report of the Joint Select Committee on the Mysore Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Bill, 1964, be extended till the end of October 1966."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE SALES TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1966

Motion to Consider—(*Debate continued*).

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ ಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಧ್ಯೇಯೋದ್ದೇಶವಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಿದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲದ್ದೆ ಯಾವ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವಾಗಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಆಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ, ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಕೆಲವು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ನಾನು ಕೆಲವು ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

[MR DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

ಅವರು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲು ನನಗೆ ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಅತ್ಯುಪಯುಕ್ತವಾದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು ವೃಥಾ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅನೇಕ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತವೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ್ದನ್ನು ಅವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ, ನಾವು ನಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಿ ಮನೆಗೆ ಹೋಗೋಣ ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ನ್ಯೂನತೆಗಳು ಇವೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಪನ್ಮೂಲಗಳನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಜನ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವ ವಿಷಯ ಏನು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ತಾವು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಮಗೆ ಜನರ ಸಂಪರ್ಕ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ನಿಮಗೆ ಇದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಈ ಖಾದಿ ಬೋರ್ಡು, ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ವೆಲ್‌ಫೇರ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ಕೂ ಹಣ ಬೇಕು. ಹಣ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಸರಕಾರ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕುತ್ತದೆ. ದೇಶ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಇಷ್ಟೇ. ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರ ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದ್ದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಸರಕಾರ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅತ್ಯಾವಶ್ಯಕ. ಹಣದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಹಣವಿದ್ದವರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಹಣವಿಲ್ಲದವರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಖಾದಿ ಬೋರ್ಡು, ಸೋಷಿಯಲ್ ವೆಲ್‌ಫೇರ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟು, ಉತ್ಸವ ಮೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿರುವ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರು, ಡಿವಿಜನಲ್ ಕಮೀಷನರ್ ಅವರು ಇವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕು ? ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಡ್ರೆಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಓದಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಸ್ಕ್ಯಾಂಟಿ ಇದೆ ? ಅವರು ಬಹಳ ವಯಸ್ಸಾದವರು. ಅಂಥವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಒಂದು-ಒಂದೂ ಕಾಲು ಗಂಟೆ ವರೆಗೆ ಅವರಿಂದ ಓದಿಸಿದಿರಿ. ಇದು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕು ? ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೇನು ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಇದೆ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದಿಲ್ಲಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಮೂರು ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಗೆ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸ್ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಇವರು ಒಂದು ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಏನು ಸಂಬಂಧವಿಲ್ಲ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸೇಲ್ಸ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬಿಲ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕು.